

From: Catherine Farrell <clf\_scw@hotmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 10:49 PM  
Subject: Master Plan

---

My understanding is that in an R-1 zoning district, as a matter of right, a multi-family dwelling can be constructed. In my opinion, such proposals should be individually evaluated to make sure such a structure makes sense.

Catherine Farrell

From: "Carol Kowalski" <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>  
To: "David Fields" <DFields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/13/2015 02:28 PM  
Subject: Fwd: Master Plan Comment

---

-----Original Message-----

From: "Jim Feeney" <JFeeney@town.arlington.ma.us>  
To: "Carol Kowalski" <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Cc: "Christine Bongiorno" <CBongiorno@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: Tue, 13 Jan 2015 13:50:49 -0500  
Subject: Master Plan Comment

Hi Carol,

I wanted to take a moment to applaud your team's efforts on the Master Plan- it is a remarkable undertaking.

While perusing the draft and listening to the presentation, I sensed many parallels to a presentation Mark Fenton, a public health planner, gave to health officers in the fall; his presentation hinged on designing healthier communities. While the vision for the Town proposed in the Master Plan satisfies many different stated goals, I could not help but notice it also promoted active living- not just in the sense of community involvement, but in the sense of physical activity. I saw a plan for a community that is inherently more physically active and mobile, which, ultimately, is a plan for combating the growing obesity epidemic. Through the increase of mixed-use development, the preservation of open space, the expansion of recreational programs, and the delivery of a built environment that is safe, accessible and inviting to pedestrians, bicyclists, and mass transit users, we will have a citizenry that gets the recommended 30 minutes a day (of physical activity) simply going about their business, not by going to the gym. The 'walkability' and 'interconnectedness' resulting from mixed-use development seem to make physical activity the logical choice for residents.

Good luck,

Jim

James Feeney, MPH, REHS/RS  
Health Compliance Officer  
Town of Arlington  
27 Maple Street  
Arlington, MA 02476  
tel: 781-316-3170  
fax: 781-316-3175

From: richterg@aol.com  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us, tfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 09:51 PM  
Subject: Comments on Master Plan Draft

---

Town Planning Office:

I wasn't sure if there was a dfields - so I'm sending it to Ted Fields tfields e-mail as well.

Here are my comments.

Thanks,  
Wendy

### Master Plan Final Draft

Comments in Bold by Wendy Richter

#### Intro

all headers should match the section (through out document)

p.1 Citizen Interviews...Planning and Community Development

Town Day September 2013 and 2014

Under Economic Development Recommendations add:

p. 11 (also add in Cultural Resources Section)

10. Pursue Mass Cultural Council Designation

Under Open Space & Natural Resources

Bring in recommendations as listed on p.111

(All recommendations found in individual sections section should also appear in the introduction)

#### Land Use

p. 22 photo of Duplex TH 2 car wide park under

Was this actually preferred in the preference survey? – As infill is it to scale?

(The picture shows it as bigger than the neighboring houses and has a wider curb cut)

Also, the MillBrook TH development with the tight courtyard – was that a preferred new development? These photos show variety – but do they mean to show preference?

#### Housing

p. 51 Photo of new housing on Mass Ave – nice image – but contrary to the mixed use recommendations (this was business zoned property lost to purely residential use)

p. 61

Sunrise Senior Living in Arlington Heights provides  
market rate assisted living,

p.62

“The economic strain of underground

parking on small sites will discourage investors,

and there is likely less need for excessive parking

in a more walkable, transit accessible (based?) environment.”

or “walkable environment with public transit options”

the term “Accessible” can be confusing – it has come to mean handicap accessible

Under Affordable Housing Development

“The Town can instead identify sites that would be likely 40B candidates and prepare for this outcome.”  
How does the town prepare for 40B?

“replacement with large houses out of scale with the existing neighborhood.”

One aspect of “mansionization,” is the loss of smaller affordable single family homes in 2 family districts which are being torn down and replaced by large duplex town houses with park unders.

p.63

4. “The cost of parking is often the greatest hindrance to the economic feasibility of denser, urban (transit based?) developments”.  
(the term “dense urban development” may be a trigger)

Missing from housing recommendations:  
“Aging-in-place” strategies

#### Historic & Cultural

p. 93,95 header incorrectly indicates economic development coordinate all headers to match sections Under Recommendations

Coordinate Bold sentences

ADD: 14. Pursue Mass Cultural Council Designation

(All recommendations found in this section should also appear in the introduction)

#### Open Space & Natural Resources

p. 111 Replicate this Recommendations section in the introduction – the numbering is off in the intro – this section seems to have the right bold and numbering.

(All recommendations found in this section should also appear in the introduction)

#### Public Facilities

p.132-133 Replicate this Recommendations section in the introduction. There have been additional line items which do not occur in the introduction section.

(All recommendations found in this section should also appear in the introduction)

#### Comments on Maps:

##### Roadways

The roadway through the cemetery looks the same as public tertiary roads – is it actually a roadway or a vehicular “path?”

##### Traffic

The light at Highland and Mass Ave is missing.

From: Thomas Davison <thmdavison@gmail.com>  
To: "dfields@town.arlington.ma.us" <dfields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 08:35 PM  
Subject: Comment on Master Plan

---

The master plan states that Arlington owns a good number of buildings that are currently leased, such as the Parmenter school and the Gibbs building. The plan also notes that the Town has very little open space that can be used for new commercial or public building construction. The plan also notes the growing number of families with school age children. I recommend as part of a comprehensive look at Town owned buildings that we consider recommissioning some of the town owned buildings as new elementary schools and or middle schools. I understand that the high school may be a priority due to potential accreditation problems, but a long range master plan should consider the potential for the re-use of old school buildings to be brought up to code as a way to alleviate the crunch of students our schools currently absorb. This is also good fiscal policy as the school system is one of the drivers that has led to a steady appreciation of residential property values. Maintaining high standards and a high performing school district is in the interest of home owners and by extension, the commercial sector in town.

Thomas Davison  
Stowecroft Road

Sent from my iPad

From: Elisa M <elisamacdonald@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 06:51 PM  
Subject: arlington master plan

---

To echo what was said in the plan, please be sure as you build buildings with retail on the bottom and residential on the top that you keep height under 5 stories to preserve the charm of the town.

Also, as the residential properties increase (building up) it is critically important that the town seriously address the overcrowded classrooms and space issues in the elementary schools. It seems like there is a lot of talk about this issue, yet the kindergarten classes that our children are now in still have 25 students packed into small classrooms!

Lastly, we noticed the report discussed the town's response to the tree damage from the microbursts and we understand that this is a real challenge and appreciate the swift tree limb removal that the town has done. Our concern is that many of the trees are cut down completely (when one branch is damaged) and the town is cutting them in a way that leaves very unattractive stumps, sometimes several feet high - really lowers the curb appeal.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our opinions.

Sincerely,  
Elisa and Bob MacDonald

From: Mark Kaepplein <markk02474@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 05:25 PM  
Subject: Master Plan comment

---

I found the transportation section the most lacking in the document without any actual public support for the stated goals. Over 90% of travel in Arlington is via motor vehicle, both personal and MBTA ones. Bicycling is a fringe mode on the streets, safest on the Minuteman, and has stalled as a fad. The tail should not wag the dog under democracy.

Residential family growth is unsustainable from a town finance standpoint, largely due to education costs. Its irresponsible planning to promote residential use other than for elderly and 1-2 bedroom units. Commercial development is fiscally sustainable, however.

Commercial growth depends on good transportation. Arlington does not have enough residents to sustain more business, so relies on residents outside to come spend money. Virtually all come via motor vehicles on roadways. Few from outside Arlington walk or bicycle here to frequent businesses.

Major deterrents to visiting Arlington are: Firstly, traffic congestion and travel time getting here. Second, an ability to conveniently park here. Both must be easier and more attractive for visitors to come here than go elsewhere.

Traffic increased and congestion decreased are both needed on Route 16, Lake Street, Pleasant Street, Mystic street, Mass Ave, and Summer Street in order to grow commercial redevelopment, jobs, and the Arlington economy. The congestion is many decades old and made worse by road projects in the past 25 years. Arlington needs to appeal to the state to get Route 16 widened by two lanes from Mass Ave to Alewife circle so redevelopment and prosperity of East Arlington and North Cambridge are uncorked. The route 16 right of way is public land held hostage by DCR.

One underused parcel in Arlington screaming for redevelopment is the east Arlington Walgreen's. It has parking, access to the Minuteman, access to Mass Ave. and public transit, walking distance to two centers, and beautiful views of Spy Pond. It would be an ideal location for a 7 floor class-A office tower and/or residences above a retail store.

The Homewood Suites Hotel in east Arlington is an ideal anchor for office buildings, which bring jobs and lunch/dinner patrons to Arlington. Even if some houses must be razed in redevelopment of the area, the result is very positive for the town. Proximity to Alewife station and business park gives this part of Arlington the most future opportunity. Its all held back by route 16 congestion, which must be fixed.

This is the kind of 10, 20, 50, and 100 year vision I see lacking in the Master Plan.

Sincerely,  
Mark Kaepplein  
11 Palmer Street  
Arlington, MA 02474  
617-417-0315



From: Teresa Harrington <tmh1017@aol.com>  
To: "dfields@town.arlington.ma.us" <dfields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 04:53 PM  
Subject: Long Range Plan

---

Dear Mr. Fields,  
I attend the informational meeting last Monday. I was very disappointed to not hear anything about our high school possibly loosing accreditation.

This should be one of the long range plans for the future of our students and residents. Arlington's real estate inventory has been very active due major highways within our proximity and the public transportation offered.. When prospective buyers inquire about our school system they will be disappointed to know about Arlington's failing to acquire accreditation for the high school. Property values will definitely decline.

I understand all the concerns about density with a variety of housing issues.

We need to keep zoning codes. Arlington's neighbourhood 's vary. East Arlington is dense due to multi-family dwellings & some of those have been converted into condo's even adding a third level for more bedrooms. Mass Ave, Broadway & Summer St. Would be excellent for more building projects with commercial business's on the ground level.

Another important issue that Arlington has been dealing with over the years is parking. The time for resolution is upon us. If one is to think that more building would take place on Mass. Ave . parking needs to be addressed.

The environmental issues with the Mugar Property explained by Elsie Fiore is important to the residents in East Arlington.

But over building Arlington is important to many property owner's.

As a long time property owner I want to thank all the volunteers for their input.

I do fail to understand how the consulting company did not treat this long term plan as a business plan for the town with some approximate future cost to the town and tax payers.

I did take the time to read all 200+ pages of the first draft and still feel that the updated draft needs more clarity. And there are many other items I could have written about but I'm sure others home owners and residents are more knowledgable.

Thanks you for taking the time to read my email.

Teresa M. Harrington  
Sent from my iPhone

From: Adam Auster <adam.auster.arlington@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 04:04 PM  
Subject: Master Plan comments

---

I hope the Town will include architectural standards in zoning bylaws adopted under the Master Plan, especially for the Mass. Ave. and Broadway corridors.

The Master Plan proposes changing many uses now only allowed by special permit to by right. There is obvious merit to this, but at the same time it is a loss of control.

It seems to me that most of the hopes I have heard voiced about the master plan, and growth and change, center around uses. We could have more jobs in town, a bigger commercial tax base, and so forth.

But most of the fears seem to be about how things will look and feel. I think we can honor both of these impulses by including both use and form in zoning.

I don't pretend to know what best practices are in this respect, but I know that other communities have architectural standards boards that review proposals for different architectural criteria. Some promulgate specific architectural-design standards.

Is it possible to specify standards for materials in zoning bylaws or other regulation? Can we describe how we want buildings to relate to public spaces and their surroundings?

Could we require, along the Mass. Ave. corridor for instance, that new development must be qualitatively as good or better than the structures it abuts?

Adam Auster

10 Cottage Ave.

Arlington MA

From: Stephen Harrington <sth.alist@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 03:50 PM  
Subject: Master Plan comments

---

Hi,

Here are my comments.

1. I was interviewed early on in the process and made a few points that were completely ignored in the current plan. Specifically, I asked that property tax policy be incorporated for long term planning and the Board of Assessors be involved in the planning process. I see no mention in the plan of either of these items.

2. I mentioned development of the Poet's corner playground area as an office park and saw no mention of a plan for these large, empty parcels, nor any mention of utilizing some town owned parcels for development that would attract large business tenants,

3. I see no vision of an economic engine for long term, sustainable growth for Arlington. Mixed use development, tourism, etc. are all small, incremental changes that will not have the necessary impact to Arlington's economic future. Looking at surrounding towns they each have an engine of economic growth; whether it is the Winchester Hospital and the professional jobs and residents that such a facility attracts, the combination of Tufts University and Green line extension that Medford has, the Rt 2/Rt 128, Hartwell Ave industrial and office park areas that Lexington has or the myriad educational and biotech areas of Cambridge - each of our neighbors has an engine for economic growth. This master plan failed to articulate such a vision for Arlington.

Stephen Harrington  
TMM P13

From: Charlotte Milan <charlottemilan@gmail.com>  
To: "dfields@town.arlington.ma.us" <dfields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 03:35 PM  
Subject: Master plan comments

---

Under Land use recommendations: the Arlington sustainability action plan is due for an update. Other communities undertaking climate planning (Cambridge and Boston) are adding Climate Preparedness a Planning and studying the potential financial, infrastructure, and operational risks associated with larger and more frequent storms such as Sandy. Such an update should be made in arlington's planning and that priority could be better spelled out in the master plan.

Charlotte Milan

From: "refdesk@world.std.com" <refdesk@world.std.com>  
To: David Fields <dfields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 02:54 PM  
Subject: Arlington Master Plan comments 01-20-2015

---

Arlington has wonderful walkability, and wonderful livability. We have been given a precious heritage of compact layout, dense housing, small businesses, sidewalks, trees, bus routes, and historic buildings. It is up to us to be as walkable and livable in the 21st century as we were in the 19th. We can do this.

Density is good, when done with an eye to sharing the benefits and challenges of density. Mixing housing with workplaces and commerce is good, if done fairly and safely. Arlington is built on 400 years of infill housing, infill business, and mixed use of land. If we plan well, Arlington will benefit from another four centuries of mixed use, infill, and moderate density. Please allow this to happen. Change the zoning code, if need be. Add additional floors and floorspace to existing buildings, if need be.

Compact, moderate density, mixed use, "streetcar suburbs" that are near subway lines; like Arlington and Brookline; offer a quality of life that people increasingly want. People are moving to Arlington and staying in Arlington because they want to walk, bike, take the subway, and take the bus - to shop, to school, to work, to Town services, and to recreate. People do not move to Arlington because they want to drive cars or to park cars for hours a day.

Excess surface parking can destroy the moderate density that residents want, and that local businesses need. Rivers of cars speeding through our town, effectively cutting it into isolated pieces, can destroy this. Please limit any additional surface parking, and strictly enforce traffic laws concerning speed and safety of car travel. Red lights mean stop, and 40 miles an hour on side streets means we need more traffic tickets. Instead of increasing parking and speeding, increase walkability, shuttle service, bus service, and bikeability. Decrease the need for travel by increasing compact land use and mixed use zoning.

Arlington must be in control of the destiny of Arlington. Do not give blank checks to large developers or large employers. Small to mid-sized developers of housing, small to mid-sized employers, and small to mid-sized businesses tend to return more to the local community and economy than do large absentee owners. Recruit employers and businesses to Arlington that are appropriate sizes and types. Provide education and advice to help them survive and prosper. Help negotiate realistic deals between owners and renters of commercial real estate to fill empty store fronts and offices. Any employer, developer, nonprofit or business that creates a workable plan to get people where they need to be with fewer cars and less parking should

get preference. Allow smaller parking lots, or none at all. Allow smaller set back, or none at all.

Trees protect us from flooding. Most parts of Arlington already flood frequently, and may flood more in the future. If we plan to stay in a flood plain, we must protect our trees. Protect mature trees, strongly restrict the cutting of trees, and strongly encourage and reward the planting of additional trees - on public and private land.

Sidewalks and the bike path are a major source of usable open space and outdoor recreation for Arlingtonians of all ages, and are major arteries of travel. Maintain, repair, and clear snow from the major arteries that happen to be sidewalks and the bike path, and that happen to carry walkers and bikes, just as you would from the major arteries that happen to be streets and roads, and that happen to carry cars and trucks. Install and maintain sidewalks on all streets and roads in town.

Protect the historic buildings we have left. Repair and maintain buildings such as Town Hall, Robbins Library, and Arlington High School. Add to them, repair them, maintain them, rent them out, and keep them fully used. But do not sell them off or tear them down. Do not tear down any more historic buildings. Put our resources into keeping them in good repair instead.

Keep up the good work in planning and implementation. Thank you for all you have done for Arlington.

Rachael Stark



From: Lenard Diggins <ldiggins@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 02:27 PM  
Subject: Master Plan suggestion/comment

---

Hello,

First, I regret that I was not able to participate in the Master Plan project more. That said, I've read the a lot of the draft, and it is a very well-written document.

I have an idea concerning bicycles lanes that I think is too complicated at this stage in the process. I discussed it briefly with Barbara Thornton this weekend, and upon further consideration, I've decided to pass it along anyway. The idea: study the possibility of elevated bike lanes on major streets such as Mass Ave. Of course, elevated bike lanes would work better if the network extended beyond Arlington, so the study would involve discussions with neighboring communities. Also, there might be the possibility of collaborating with Hubway on such a project.

I will keep this brief for now, If you want to discuss this further, please feel free to contact me via email or phone (508-364-2382).

Thanks for your attention,  
Len

From: "Joey Glushko" <JGlushko@town.arlington.ma.us>  
To: "Carol Kowalski" <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>, "David Fields" <DFields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 01:40 PM  
Subject: Fwd: Thoughts on Arlington Master Plan

---

See following -  
Joey Glushko, Planner  
Planning and Comm. Devel.  
Arlington, MA 02476  
Phone: 781-316-3093

-----Original Message-----

From: "Barber, Brad" <bbarber@akamai.com>  
To: Joey Glushko <JGlushko@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Cc: "bradb@shore.net" <bradb@shore.net>  
Date: Tue, 20 Jan 2015 13:20:29 -0500  
Subject: Thoughts on Arlington Master Plan

Hi Joey,

Many thanks for helping to organize the discussion of Arlington's Master Plan last week.

Some thoughts as you prepare the plan for Town Meeting.

-- The abbreviated draft has lots of suggestions, but it doesn't carry the voice of Arlington. Many of the items were generic and could apply to other towns. It may be better to select a few items that are specific to Arlington, or that make Arlington a special place to live.

-- The abbreviated draft needs an overview – what are the goals of the master plan and what is not covered.

-- The high school is one of Arlington's biggest worry. It should be discussed up front, even if it is not part of the Master Plan.

-- The key findings needs organization. What is important to Arlington residents? What needs to be fixed soon? Where do we want Arlington in 10-20 years?

The plan is rich with ideas. Some organization and emphasis could make it a good plan for Arlington's future.

--Brad

74 Spy Pond Pkwy  
District 2

From: Wynelle Evans <evco7@earthlink.net>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 12:46 PM  
Subject: comments on Master Plan draft v. 2

---

Dear Mr. Fields:

I've followed this process since the first community meeting, and have been so impressed by the creative thinking, inclusiveness, and general smarts of all the Town employees and volunteers involved, as well as by the structure of the process designed and overseen by RKG Associates.

Arlington has changed in many ways in the almost 30 years I've lived here, some wonderful (the Bikepath, the explosion of restaurants, the revitalization of Arlington Heights and East Arlington); some not so wonderful (the loss of Symmes and the Brigham site for yet more market-rate residential development, the lack of any significant mid-sized business development).

Of these changes, the current boom in residential development troubles me the most, for several reasons.

1. The majority of it is ugly, and out of scale with surrounding houses. We're going to lose the unique neighborhoods and quality homes that make Arlington so appealing. We really don't need any more completely generic, vinyl-sided townhouses or McMansions. Particularly not ones that go on the market at \$750,000.00 and up.
2. This development is costing us open space. Lots are clear cut to facilitate construction; two houses are going up on lots that held one house; houses are being built up and out to the limits. Open space is a lot more than parks and conservation areas. It's also small un-developed lots, and large lots that allow visual variety.
3. It's coming at a cost to the town which we cannot sustain. The belief that increasing density will lead to increasing revenues is incorrect, and demonstrably so. I've looked at many Cost of Community Services studies, and they all conclude, unambiguously, that new residential development costs a town more than it generates in new revenues. Schools are a particularly expensive budget item. Rising property taxes threaten many long-time Arlington residents.

Arlington is fully built-out in its residential neighborhoods. We need to acknowledge this and not imagine that by shoe-horning houses into spaces where they were never meant to be, we can somehow tap a flow of revenue. Arlington needs mixed-use development, with a commitment to low- and moderate-priced housing, and a commitment to preserving neighborhoods

along with our varied and appealing older housing stock.

The Master Planning process has so far gone through several swings about encouraging new development. At the community meetings I attended, people were fairly united in supporting mixed use development, but not new residential development. The first draft of the Plan then contained recommendations which would have allowed a boom in new residential development. The second draft had removed all those recommendations.

There seems to be a lot of uncoordinated thinking about this extremely important issue. My feeling is that RKG Associates ran the meetings, listened and collected input, and then presented a first draft full of some fairly cookie-cutter ideas, many of which ignored all that community feedback.

My hope for the next draft, and for the town's approach to this whole process, is that, rather than no mention of new residential development, it will contain suggestions for expressly preventing it. Rather than continuing along the path of least resistance to development, we need to control it, and make it the kind of development that will best serve Arlington, not developers.

Best wishes,  
Wynelle Evans

-----

Wynelle Evans  
20 Orchard Place  
Arlington, MA 02476  
781.643.4547 office  
781.859.9291 mobile  
781.643.5435 fax  
[evco7@earthlink.net](mailto:evco7@earthlink.net)

From: Michael Ruderman <amruderman@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 11:53 AM  
Subject: Comments on the Draft Master Plan

---

For a different perspective on the project, I began by reading the numerous comments first, and then the corresponding Plan sections. I find the comments submitted outside of the electronic survey mechanism by Mr. Loreti and by the Fiscal Resources Task Group especially perspicacious.

Overall, and most pointedly in the realms of land use and zoning, there is bias towards "more" as the solution for every perceived problem. Build more affordable housing, build more and higher and denser commercial structures, build out every unbuilt plot of land (and allow the presently illegal practice of aggregating side yards into new building lots) in residential neighborhoods, and create more playgrounds and parking spaces too; the "have it all" tone is a sad disappointment for a plan so long in development.

Nowhere in the Draft is there a discussion of the costs of things, not the social costs of increasing density (increased traffic, noise pollution, commercial intrusions into neighborhoods), not even the "hard" costs (land, site preparation, construction) of selected projects. To mention only one such omission, there is not even an estimate of the cost of securing the development rights to the so-called Mugar Parcel.

I especially regret finding no analysis of Arlington's most recent exercise in "build it all and reap the profits", the development of the Symmes Hospital site. How much has actually been returned to the town in building permits and real estate taxes, compared against the costs of services to these new homes and their families?

I had hoped the Draft Master Plan would compare costs of proposals and present choices for the town's future.

--

A. Michael Ruderman  
[amruderman@gmail.com](mailto:amruderman@gmail.com)  
(781) 929-7847

# ARLINGTON DRAFT MASTER PLAN

## Memorandum to the Redevelopment Board

These comments are supplemental to my communication dated November 27, 2014 (Q.V.), and are based in large part on input by the public at the hearing on January 12, 2015, and conversations with participants therein following the hearing.

### *The Process Was Flawed*

Despite diligent efforts at numerous public meetings to collect names, postal addresses and e-mail addresses (to what end?), there was little or no effort to let the people who supplied such information notices of subsequent meetings, copies of documents etc. The assumption that people – however devoted – are going to check the Town website every few minutes to find out what is going on is obviously unrealistic, and smacks of an effort to exclude rather than include citizens in the process.

The time-frames for comment have been ridiculous. After two years of hearings and meetings, a draft report was issued just a couple of weeks before Thanksgiving, and, if one could get a copy of it, read it, analyze, and comment, it had to be at the sacrifice of time spent by most people in family events around the Thanksgiving holiday.

Then, in the run up to your hearing on January 12, a revised draft report was made available (to those in the know) just a week beforehand. Although a revision of the original draft, it was not redlined, so that one was faced with reading 212 pages to find out what the changes were.

At a very early stage in the process I was asked to review some historical background material, which I did. Many of the corrections were of names, spellings, and other items that could have been readily ascertained by anyone who did half way decent research, or subjected their material to some level of fact checking. Yet in later drafts, many errors in other readily ascertainable facts have been discovered. The amount of reading of the report I have done, and the areas in which I know specific facts are both limited, so one has to wonder what other false assumptions and downright errors are throughout the consultants' work – and wonder if there was any effort on the part of the committee or staff to review the material.

One is reminded of the cynical aphorism “close enough for government work.”

In general it appears that the vast amount of public input solicited at various meetings and hearings has in large part been ignored, and some one or more persons – perhaps consultants, – have submitted their own views and recommendations based on their ideas of what Arlington should become.

### *Land Use and Housing*

Contrary to an assertion at the January 12 hearing, Arlington does not “have to accept more density.” Let the 339 communities in the Commonwealth – four of which abut Arlington – accept some more density before we are further imposed upon. Open space is our scarcest resource, and all of it, public and private must be preserved as the No. 1 priority.

As was pointed out at the hearing, additional residential housing actually costs the Town more in services than it produces in tax revenue. I agree that affordable housing should be increased rapidly (to a sufficient level to escape from the threat of 40B), if this can be done within existing structures or otherwise previously developed areas – such as the Housing Corporation’s Capital Square project, and within the parameters of our zoning by law.

Although technically not “affordable,” small post-war houses, some of which are on decent sized lots could be the nearest thing to affordable family housing if present zoning and assessment policies did not make these houses targets for developers who tear down, build monster houses that sell for big prices, and take their profits back home to Weston or Lincoln. At this point in a fully built-out town, only developers profit from development. This problem could be addressed at least in part on page 62, last paragraph, by changing “might” to “must.”

Mixed use in the commercial/business zones can be a slippery slope, and was decisively rejected at Town Meeting in recent years, when it was exposed as a Trojan horse to build more high-rise apartment buildings. Any such zoning must contain a not-insignificant percentage requirement for business and/or commercial uses. Of course, the long-established five-storey limit must be observed.

#### *Historical Resources*

The recommendations under this section are generally positive, and call for expenditures, which might be made from CPA funds. However, there seems to be a lack of understanding about the relationship and interplay of the Historical Commission, the Historic District Commissions, the Demotion Delay By-Law, and Chapter 40C of the General Laws.

#### *Trees*

The sentiments and recommendations regarding trees are very positive. Unfortunately, it seems that at present, there is more enthusiasm for cutting trees down than for planting new ones. As mentioned heretofore, consideration should be given to enacting a by-law, as was done some years ago in Lexington, to provide a public hearing process for substantial trees on private property, similar to that currently in effect for street trees.

Sometimes non-Town trees are taken down for no apparent reason, and such a process might be useful in that regard.. A particularly egregious example is the Post Office on Court Street. A few years ago, they cut down a magnificent large tree to the left of the front entrance in order to build a ramp for handicapped access – and then built the ramp on the right side of the entrance.

#### *Failure to Address Assessment Issues*

Although many recommendations in the draft plan suggest or recommend the hiring of additional staff or retention of more consultants, no effort has been made to consider where the money would come from, or how to address the structural deficit that the Town faces.

Part of the solution would be a reform of current, apparently irrational, assessment policies. A recent survey of changes from the prior year to the current fiscal year, shows a wildly differing pattern of changes, or failures to change. Furthermore, multi-family structures are apparently not assessed on what they would sell for, but on some other basis, whereas one and two-family homes are in many cases assessed at some very substantial percentage - perhaps 90 or 95% - of full market value.

An interesting exception brought to my attention following the hearing - two of those outsize houses, recently built on the sites of tear-downs, and sold - were assessed at about 75% of their sale prices.

A rational assessment pattern for a town that values its open space would be to apply the highest rate to the minimum sized lot, and assesses vacant land on the premises at a lower rate, thus not penalizing those who provide oxygen, animal habitat, and just breathing space in our congested community.

#### *Failure to Address Environmental Issues*

Although we cannot control what goes on beyond our borders – such as Cambridge’s irresponsible permitting of dense high rise development at or near our southern border - we cannot avoid its effects. Climate change and increased flooding – particularly in East Arlington, much of which is virtually at sea level, and around the Mystic Lakes – are well know facts which we will have to address sooner or later, yet there is no mention of such issues, never mind what might be done about them.

This is said to be a ten-year plan. The natural world is not going to wait for ten years.

#### *Conclusion*

If a really good and appropriate master plan is desired, then it would seem that presentation to Town Meeting should be delayed until a much better draft can be prepared and vetted in a process in which the public is really given an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way.

John L. Worden III  
27 Jason Street  
Town Meeting Member, Pct 8

January 18, 2015



-----Original Message-----

From: M Lambert <michellelambert19@gmail.com>

To: Laura Wiener <LWiener@town.arlington.ma.us>

Cc: Carol Kowalski <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>

Date: Sun, 18 Jan 2015 21:03:40 -0500

Subject: Re: Master Plan follow-up

Hi Laura,

Thank you so much for reaching out to me. I was glad to be able to attend the public hearing and was so pleased to hear about and read about all of the great aspects of the master plan. Thank you all again for your hard work on it.

I agree with you 100% that the reason that young families are likely not more involved is twofold. It is very difficult to get to early evening meetings that often conflict with young child bedtimes. And second, many of us are so involved with the schools and the PTO and other related things that most of our focus is there.

I am definitely interested in getting more involved in some way with the future of Arlington's built environment, but I hesitate because of the restrictions I mentioned. I work part time and my husband works full time, and it is nearly impossible for me to get to any weekday meetings before 7pm. Also, I have recently reached out to get involved with the process of renovating the Stratton school where my daughter goes to school and hope to be able to volunteer some time with that.

That being said, I would be interested in hearing more about the commitment involved in the Master Plan Implementation Committee to see if it would be feasible at all with my schedule. Let me know what would be a good time and I can give you a call next week.

Thank you,  
Michelle Lambert

From: "Carol Kowalski" <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>  
To: "David Fields" <DFields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 08:54 AM  
Subject: Fwd: Master Plan and Economic Dev. Issues.

---

Carol Kowalski AICP  
Director of Planning & Community Development  
Town of Arlington, MA  
Phone: 781-316-3092

-----Original Message-----

From: "Massinvestor/ VC News Daily" <info@massinvestor.com>  
To: <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 2015 19:11:12 -0500  
Subject: Master Plan and Economic Dev. Issues.

Hi Carol-- Thanks for calling the other day and discussing the Master Plan and Economic Dev. Issues.

Here are my thoughts on the subject:

1) I don't think it's out of the question for the Town to have a Vision of transforming current commercial properties to sites that can include Class A office space.

As we all know, a purely commercial development, rather than mixed-use, would provide greater net revenues to the Town.

While there are limited large commercial parcels in existence, the ones that do exist: Mirak Properties and Davidson owned properties off Park Ave. and Lowell; as well as contiguous properties on Sunnyside Ave. and Dudley St., are mostly devoted to automotive and transportation businesses.

Could willing sellers of these properties be married with developers interested in building Class A offices in Arlington?

Could the Town itself have a leading role in helping to build out this vision?

Watertown, for example, has a substantial number of life sciences companies occupying 1-3 story structures along Arsenal St. Prominent companies include: AthenaHealth, Enanta, and Selecta, to name a few (see <http://biopharmguy.com/links/company-by-location-new-england.php> for a larger list).

Could Mirak Automotive (13 acres) someday be the "Arlington Innovation Park" with a few Class A office buildings?

2) Another prospective development type that could be promoted is Active Senior Communities. If Class A office space doesn't come to fruition, and residential development is the only type that attracts builders, then a 55+ year-old community could potentially be attractive. It gibes with macro-demographic trends, and provides the Town an attractive

option-- purely residential development, with the higher net revenues that commercial development affords.

Carol-- I'm sure you're inundated with ideas/ complaints, but since you asked, you got my two cents. :)

Good luck with the plan-- I think you guys have done a great job!

Take care--  
Mike

Michael Stern  
Massinvestor, Inc.  
PO Box 711  
Winchester, MA 01890  
617-620-4606

[www.massinvestor.com](http://www.massinvestor.com)

From: "Carol Kowalski" <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>  
To: "David Fields" <DFields@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/20/2015 08:54 AM  
Subject: Fwd: Arlington Master Plan

---

Carol Kowalski AICP  
Director of Planning & Community Development  
Town of Arlington, MA  
Phone: 781-316-3092

-----Original Message-----

From: Adam Auster <adam.auster.arlington@gmail.com>  
To: bruce.lawfitz@verizon.net  
Cc: Carol Kowalski <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>, Laura Wiener  
<lwiener@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: Mon, 19 Jan 2015 21:30:20 -0500  
Subject: Arlington Master Plan

Excuse me, I got Bruce's email address wrong, so resending.

Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick:

At last week's public hearing you invited me to tell you and the Board about specific parts of the draft Master Plan that I found puzzling or difficult to follow. After the hearing I admitted to you that my criticisms were based on the November draft, of which I made notes that I was unable to fashion into comment by the deadline last year.

The new draft is better, and better organized, and some of the passages I had cited my notes as examples of topics that needed attention have been removed. (I thought that the discussion of accessory apartments and of possible changes to the parking ban were not well supported in the draft.) Still I think the document can be strengthened editorially.

Let me begin by praising a passage that works very well, a paragraph (p. 62) about mixed-use development:

> Mixed-Use Development. In the development of this master plan, residents have expressed the desire for the Town to promote mixed-use development in the business districts. They cite advantages such as bringing more people within walking distance of stores and restaurants, incentivizing redevelopment and increasing business district property values, creating affordable housing opportunities, and reducing dependence on single-occupancy vehicle trips to meet basic household needs. To make mixed-use projects realistic, however, Arlington would have to allow a maximum height

greater than thirty-five feet in order to have attractive, marketable buildings over three stories with ground-floor business uses. Some opponents to height increases, however, say Arlington is already overbuilt and too dense. Off-street parking policies will also need to be reformed to be in line with more urban commercial planning practices. The economic strain of underground parking on small sites will discourage investors, and there is likely less need for excessive parking in a more walkable, transit accessible environment.

This passage cites specific advantages and disadvantages and is a fair summary that might serve as the basis to discuss issues related to a mixed-use zoning-bylaw change. It describes trade-offs. All of the concerns cited seem understandable.

By contrast, there's less information on the same page in the paragraphs about teardowns. There is a useful description of steps the Town could take, But what is the potential for mansionization in Arlington? People (including me) don't like the idea, but what are the consequences really? How much of the town might be affected? How much has been?

Other discussion may also benefit from a similar sensibility.

How exactly does the hodgepodge of zoning districts along Mass. Ave. contribute to this following: "Encouraging continuity of development and the cohesion of the streetscape, as well as density of development, is difficult." (36) I don't doubt that this is so, but what are the practical problems? I think that planners understand this. I don't.

State the problem clearly. E.g., the discussion (36) that includes "Applicants should be able to anticipate what the Town wants to see in the business districts and plan their projects accordingly" should be accompanied by an explanation of how the current bylaw fails to do this (with examples) and a description of likely consequences, or better yet what the consequences have been.

These are examples of discussions in the draft that are not bad but could be better.

One other thing. During the hearing Carol Kowalski referred to lost opportunities in the absence of a plan. It was effective and clarifying to think in those terms.

I do not know if that sort of discussion belong in the Master Plan or in subsequent materials developed to explain it, but I think that describing these issues in terms of the problems that planning can resolve or improve is a good place to begin with Town Meeting and the public.

Adam Auster

Cottage Ave.

**Comments on Arlington Draft Master Plan additional to comments  
already submitted for the January 12 Hearing on the Draft Master Plan  
1/19/2015**

**Patricia Worden**

**The Draft Master Plan (DMP) is a defective and misleading document. The Town of Arlington has wasted money on its creation by the chosen consultants who have produced a plan which is in many important ways antithetical to vast majority of citizens' input which they solicited and of which they have records. It would have been better and more fiscally responsible to require the majority of the work to be done by Arlington employees who would have been somewhat familiar with the Town and probably more respectful of citizen input.**

**That said, the second Draft Master Plan, which was presented at the Hearing of January 12, had some improvements and made some essential changes. Most important among them was the removal of the outrageous recommendation for accessory apartments (and also the removal of by-right conversion of some single family residences to multifamily units). Ms. Carol Kowalski assured the participants at that hearing that the last remaining reference to accessory apartments on page 31 of the DMP would be eliminated in the final draft.**

**I request that these comments be included in addition to my previous comments on the Draft Master Plan in any posting of DMP comments.**

**I will not attempt a complete analysis of this sloppy DMP lacking in cohesive vision since others more skilled than I have already submitted comments (*for example*, those of Christopher Loreti and John L. Worden III). However, there are a few further points which bear mentioning:**

**Under the heading of Key Findings --**

**On page 2, item # 2 of the DMP it is stated that "*Massachusetts Avenue has the capacity for growth...Increased density through greater height and massing would benefit the corridor...*" This theme is repeated in many ways throughout the DMP and is exactly what the overwhelming majority of citizens want to avoid.**

**Page 2, items # 4 states that “*Arlington has a limited number of vacant developable land parcels...Arlington’s growth management priorities must be Massachusetts Avenue, Broadway, and the Mill Brook. Addressing Arlington’s critical environmental challenges will hinge, in part, on the policies it adopts to guide and regulate future development in these locations...*”** Multiple recommendations throughout the DMP include increased residential density in these areas. However, if the plan is to be responsive to residents’ stated preferences the aim should be to prevent or reduce residential construction in these locations. It would also require recommendations for requirement for very significant business/commercial component and strict limitations on the number of residential units in any mixed use developments. Although benefit could be derived from mixed use specifications in our zoning in addition to those of Section 5.04, item 8.19 of Arlington’s Zoning Bylaw, our desire for mixed use should not be used as a Trojan Horse for high density residential as was attempted at a recent Annual Town Meeting and soundly rejected.

**On page 2, item # 5 “*The Mill Brook is a hidden gem*” to which I must say it certainly is. Further it is stated that “*It has the potential to spawn transformative change along Massachusetts Avenue west of the center of town. Nearby properties are poised for redevelopment due to their current use, age, and ownership, their location adjacent to the waterway, and their proximity to the Minuteman Bikeway and Massachusetts Avenue.*”** This is all accurate. Unfortunately the “transformative change” which would be brought about by recommendations throughout the DMP would be disastrous for this potentially beautiful corridor which should be protected from the consultants’ urban planning and politically correct relentless push for increased residential density for our town. Arlington is the twelfth most densely populated municipality in the Commonwealth and the second most densely populated town. It will not benefit either financially or in its quality of life from increased residential density.

**Page 3, item # 14** The problems of traffic congestion will only be worsened by any increasing residential density in Arlington (there have already been increases in our surrounding traffic and contribution to gridlock due to over-development permitted by Cambridge in the Alewife vicinity where we are to have some 2,400 new neighbors).



**Page 4, item 18 states that “Arlington has very little publicly owned land. The high school, cemetery, Public Works Department and Recreation Department will have difficulty meeting future needs because there is virtually no land for expansion. Some already face capacity problems.”**

**That statement is correct and if anything understated.**

**However the DMP does not trouble to develop significant strategies for acquisition or expansion of our public land holdings other than the most obvious (and very important) large parcels - the Mugar property in East Arlington and the Great Meadows as described on page 12. For example, it does not point to multiple smaller areas where CPA funds could be used to encourage preservation or Town acquisition of open land. Nor does it show the way to maximize enjoyment and preservation of some public open space such as that in Pond Lane which is located in a favorite bird habitat corridor along the Bikeway by Spy Pond.**

**The mention in this section of the deficit in publicly owned land at the high school is illustrative of exactly the kind of residential development which should not happen in Arlington. Although the high school is much below the recommended state standards for high school land, when the adjoining Brigham’s site became available there was no apparent attempt by the Town to acquire it for addition to the high school campus. In fact the residential development which was constructed on the site was facilitated by the former town Planning Director and the enabling permits allowing variances including reduced frontage (which cause increased hazards to our high school students walking to the school) were awarded by the Zoning Board of Appeals then under its former Chairman. There is no attempt in the DMP to provide recommendations against this kind of exploitation of sites which could otherwise greatly benefit thousands of children passing through our educational system. In fact on page 12, item # 8 the DMP states that “a renovated park between Arlington High School and the Brigham’s site demonstrates that economic development can go hand in hand with natural resources protection.” This statement is cynical at best considering that the so-called “park” is a minuscule piece of land – truly representative of meaningless jargon and tokenism throughout this DMP and which the consultants consider worthy of a “measure to encourage development projects that respect and enhance adjacent open space and natural resources.”**

**Under the heading of Key Recommendations –**

**First, it should be pointed out that caution is important in analysis of the recommendations of the DMP authors regarding certain aspects of zoning and historic preservation. Their grasp of statutory underpinnings of some of Arlington’s existing operational directives is inadequate.**

### **Land Use Recommendations**

**On page 5, item 1 recommendations for Arlington’s Zoning Bylaw (ZBL) to, among other things, “*institute a good regulatory foundation...updated language, and definitions , and statutory and case law consistency.*” These are bizarre and puzzling statements since Arlington’s Zoning Bylaw has performed fairly well as an operational framework for Arlington’s development and improvement and the major source of defense from rapacious depredations of developers in our area and concomitant reduction in the quality of our life and environment which would result from these. The ZBL’s current definitions and regulations are clear and comprehensive and merit proper enforcement. They could be seriously impaired by some of the suggestions on page 5, item 3 such as “*increasing the maximum building height in and near existing building districts and reducing off-street parking requirements*” and similar recommendations throughout the DMP. In addition recommendation for mixed use redevelopment as in item 4 and various other places in the DMP should always be qualified as requiring significant and meaningful percentage requirement for building/commercial components and very limited residential component – otherwise it is just an invitation to developers for a feeding frenzy of residential development.**

**Not only has the Arlington Zoning Bylaw (ZBL) been improved from time to time by various measures, including added precautions to combat various threats, but whole new sections have been added as affordable housing and other needs arrived – as, for example, the creation of our Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw (Section 11.08 of Arlington’s Zoning Bylaw). Arlington’s Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw is considered to be one of the best in the Commonwealth.**

**On page 5, item 8 the suggestion that the ZBL should “*reduce the number of uses that require a special permit*” is particularly foolish and shows unfamiliarity with the history of development and statistics regarding the use and necessity of this tool in Arlington.**

**Page 5, item 6 contains unconvincing arguments for removal of the overnight parking ban in Arlington (see also below). Attempts to remove this ban have been spectacularly defeated at Annual Town Meetings in Arlington.**

### **Housing Recommendations**

**Page 6, item 1 advocates an Affordable Housing Plan – Housing Production Plan (HPP). Arlington is so completely built-out that the DMP should include the recommendation that increase in housing (and the only housing we need is Affordable Housing) should be done only via our Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw and/or by redevelopment/rehabilitation of existing structures essentially on the same footprint as the original building or with slight expansion to allow for adequate utilities and concomitant modernization.**

**Page 7, Item 4 recommends that “*minimum parking requirements should be removed for new multi-use developments on Massachusetts Avenue and Broadway.*” This is a very harmful recommendation in that it is sure to drive up the number and density of residential units that contractors can erect relatively cheaply if parking is not required and is also sure to increase residential and service vehicle parking on the street thereby limiting parking available for business and commercial enterprise clients. In fact, it would be best to require underground parking for any residences in the mixed use area if these are to be vibrant well-frequented areas.**

**It is interesting that among the Housing recommendations of the DMP there is no worthwhile suggestion to relieve the current mania for tear-downs and replacement of modest affordable houses by large maximum-footprint structures despite their obvious negative effects on neighbors and many voiced complaints about them. The DMP should offer constructive suggestions to ameliorate this situation.**

## **Economic Development Recommendations**

Page 7, item 1 suggests that *“the Town should encourage commercial properties along Massachusetts Avenue, Medford Street and Broadway to develop their highest and most valuable potential by slightly expanding height and lot coverage limits, and making more flexible requirements for on-site open space and parking.”* This euphemistic use of the *“highest and most valuable potential”* argument is frequently used by planners and developers resulting in despoiling of sites which deserve better treatment in favor of maximizing developer profits which latter should not be the sole function of the DMP. This recommendation should be eliminated as should similar recommendations throughout the DMP.

Page 8, second to last bullet under item 2 – states *“Allow small retail spaces by right or special permit in the industrial districts...”* This is an unfortunate recommendation – such by right construction could result in a hopeless hodge-podge of blighted endeavors. There should be no such by right construction of retail space in the Industrial districts.

## **Natural Resources and Open Space Recommendations**

Page 11, item 1 states *“Create a comprehensive plan for the Mill Brook environmental corridor.”* No attempt is made to relate this to previous observations and suggestions except for a few brief remarks such as those on pages 101 and 103 of the DMP dealing with the 2010 Open Space Committee preliminary study for a linear park abutting the Mill Brook and its pathway through Meadowbrook Park respectively.

The maximally important and vulnerable area between the Mill Brook/Minuteman Bikeway and Massachusetts Avenue requires much more attention to protective measures than the DMP has chosen to give it. There should be very specific recommendations to drastically limit density of development, to enforce adequate distance of buildings from the brook and recommendations for punitive and ameliorative initiatives to deal with violations of existing and possible future standards.

Page 12, item # 4 states *“Pursue strategies to protect large parcels of undeveloped land.”* This section should include a recommendation to

**pursue use of CPA funds for acquisition of the Mugar site in East Arlington.**

### **Conclusion**

**There is much more that could be done to improve the DMP. It is a disappointing and dangerous document reflecting a cookie-cutter developer mentality for urbanization. It is an attribute to the concepts of a politically correct Planner's Playbook and a determined attempt to manipulate public opinion and negate public conviction together with insulating our politicians and policy makers from crucial decision-making. These are disadvantages of consultants over and above the irresponsible expense of using such consultants for defective work – funds which our municipality should not have designated and provided**

**Perhaps there is a silver lining - if this abysmal DMP convinces the powers that be in Arlington that we should not hire any more consultants for Arlington's crystal ball and major development issues.**

From: Peter S <zerg90@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/20/2015 08:49 AM  
Subject: re Town Master Plan

---

I seem to remember seeing something in the Town Bylaws related to a "Quiet Zone". Perhaps it was at the Symmes Hospital. Any chance that could be mentioned in the Master Plan? Way too much noise in Arlington - sirens, noisy motor vehicles, fireworks, leaf blowers, etc.

Peter Szerlag 4 Winslow St Apt 1104 781-648-2329

From: "Judith/Michael Schaechter/Brownstein" <jdsmmb@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Cc: "Judith/Michael Schaechter/Brownstein" <jdsmmb@gmail.com>  
Date: 01/19/2015 09:56 PM  
Subject: Comments Regarding the Master Plan

---

Dear Master Plan Advisory Committee Members:

We are writing in support of your recommendation to "create safer pedestrian conditions to increase walking in Arlington" (Traffic & Circulation, Recommendation #2). Towards this end, we would like to bring your attention three interrelated public safety issues in our East Arlington neighborhood that have not been addressed in the report for which we request your action.

We live in the Marathon Street-Waldo Road-Cleveland Street area, which is among the most highly trafficked sectors in East Arlington. Marathon Street is a one-way street (directed northward) often used by vehicles to avoid Massachusetts Avenue/Route 16 intersection. Cleveland Street is the parallel one-way street (directed southward), and is often used as a cut-through for vehicles driving on Broadway. Waldo Road is used to access Marathon Street from Cleveland Street and visa versa.

We live on the corner of Marathon Street and Waldo Road. From our vantage point, we can see that this corner has many pedestrians, including parents with children and elderly, traveling to and from many local favorites including the Fox Library, Waldo and Crosby Parks. Currently, there are sidewalks along the entire length on both sides of Marathon Street, Cleveland Street and Waldo Road, with the notable exception of a length (~200 ft) along one side of Waldo Road between Marathon and Cleveland Streets. If someone is walking on the more western sidewalk along Marathon or the more eastern sidewalk along Cleveland and then turns the corner onto Waldo, all of a sudden that pedestrian is walking on the street. This endangers the pedestrian to vehicles traveling (often quickly) on Waldo or turning onto Waldo. Furthermore, since there is no sidewalk along this section of Waldo Road, muddy or icy conditions often prevail, which forces pedestrians to avoid this section by walking further into the street. The lack of this sidewalk has also resulted in many car owners using this area to park during the day and often, illegally, overnight. These parked cars exacerbate the need for pedestrians to walk into the street on route between Marathon and Cleveland.

We are requesting a sidewalk be built along this section of Waldo, thereby having the full lengths of Waldo, Marathon and Cleveland lined by sidewalks and greatly improve pedestrian safety in our neighborhood.

The second, related, public safety issue that we would like to bring to your attention is the excessive speed of many vehicles driving down Marathon

Street. While there is a stop sign on Waldo Road at its intersection with Marathon, there is no deterrent for vehicles that pick up speed along the length of Marathon. We are requesting a stop sign be added on Marathon, at its intersection with Waldo. Such a stop sign would require vehicles to slow down at this intermediate point along Marathon, thereby improving the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists and other drivers.

The third public safety issue that we would like to your attention is the speed and loudness of trucks traveling along Marathon Street. Marathon Street is a residential neighborhood. Nonetheless, large trucks often barrel down Marathon, beginning at about 6 am. Truckers probably use this street to bypass the Massachusetts Avenue/Route 16 intersection, just as many car drivers do. The excessive speed of these trucks endangers pedestrians, bicyclists and other drivers. The loudness of these trucks, accompanied by intense vibration, disrupts the neighborhood feel. In addition, some neighbors on Marathon have mentioned to us that repeated vibrations from trucks have damaged the foundation of their home, resulting in loss in property value. We are requesting that a limit, based on maximum weight, be set on trucks allowed to travel on Marathon Street.

As findings of the Traffic & Circulation report become finalized and plans are being made to implement its recommendations, we hope that the three issues that we raised will be addressed under Recommendation #2. We would appreciate confirmation that the Committee received this letter.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Brownstein and Judith Schaechter

62 Marathon Street, Arlington



From: David White <dwhite@gilbertwhite.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Cc: "LeRoyer, Ann" <annleroyer12@gmail.com>, Carol Kowalski <CKowalski@town.arlington.ma.us>  
Date: 01/19/2015 12:28 PM  
Subject: Master Plan Comments

---

## Master Plan Environmental and Open Space Goals

One part of the draft master plan for Arlington refers to a possible invasive plant bylaw.

I'd like to frame this as a broader goal: Encourage a Healthy and Sustainable Natural Environment

Invasive plants are only part of the problem. The larger issue is habitat loss which invasive plants contribute to.

To maintain an environmental balance with a variety of wildlife, a diversity of habitats which provide food and shelter are needed. Invasive plants are a problem because they can create mono-cultures that push other plants aside. Also most invasive plants don't provide any kind of food for the local wildlife. But many plants used for landscaping are not natives and also not food sources. In fact a grass lawn is pretty much the equivalent of a desert to most creatures. The best way to improve the natural habitat is to use native plants whenever possible. And also to encourage the reduction of grass areas, which has other benefits in reduced lawn care and less storm water runoff.

Some policies might be:

- Use more natural and native choices for landscaping on Town-owned properties. Consider replacement of some grass areas with native ground covers.
- Enact a bylaw to require more natural landscaping for new developments.
- Expand public education so that more homeowners improve the habitats of their properties.
- etc.

Recommended references:

"Noah's Garden: Restoring the Ecology of Our Own Backyards" by Sara Stein.

"Bring Nature Home: How Native Plants Sustain Wildlife in Our Gardens" by Douglas Tallamy.

David White, 55 Bow Street, Arlington

From: Rita Supprise <websterwing@earthlink.net>

To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us

Date: 01/17/2015 03:40 PM

Subject: Comments on Arlington Master Plan

---

Committee Members, On Monday, 1/12/15 I attended a town hall meeting of the draft of the master plan project. I am very opposed to the idea of the master plan project.

I spoke at the meeting and introduced the idea that this whole process is a movement of the UN Agenda 21 initiative. I asked that people involved in this process read a book titled "Behind the Green Mask, by Rosa Koire. Rosa tells the story of what happened in Santa Rosa, CA when fighting the dangers of UN Agenda 21.

Around the country towns and cities are facing down the threat of UN Agenda 21. Don't take my word for it, do your own homework and start with "Behind the Green Mask. This book will lead you to other sources.

Sen. Nathan Dahm of Oklahoma legislature is working hard to destroy this movement in OK . Powerful corporate lobbyists attack these efforts. Wake up Arlington.

Also go to ([americanpolicy.org](http://americanpolicy.org)) for more information, by Tom DeWeese.

Rita Supprise, Precinct 5

From: LEARMACKAY@aol.com  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Cc: dfieldsarlington@gmail.com  
Date: 01/14/2015 03:43 PM  
Subject: Master Plan for Arlington

---

Carol Kowalski, director of planning, said the town's first comprehensive master plan under state law aims to "keep Arlington's great qualities intact in the face of change" for about the next decade. The plan, she said, would promote "high-value, mixed-use development."

She made clear that the plan "does not change zoning" and that the current version remains a draft.

She said provisions for infill housing and accessory apartments, included in the November draft, had been removed in the January version. A check of the latter shows references remain, including one on p. 31.

Arlington Master Plan: Your Town, Your Future January 2015 Page 31

#### "COMPLETE NEIGHBORHOODS

Within each of Arlington's neighborhoods, consideration should be given to providing more "complete" neighborhoods that provide for a limited mix of uses and diverse housing types, close to schools, open spaces, and other activity centers. Methods may be considered such as corner stores and live-work units at designated intersections, accessory apartments, co-operative or co-housing, and others."

From: Adam Badik <aebadik@gmail.com>  
To: dfields@town.arlington.ma.us  
Date: 01/13/2015 03:50 PM  
Subject: Re: Town of Arlington: Comments on the Master Plan

---

I apologize that I was unable to attend yesterday's meeting. I reviewed portions of the plan, and did not see any reference to the Hubway bikeshare program. I did see reference to ZipCar vehicle sharing, so I was surprised that there wasn't any mention of bicycles. Arlington could easily join the regional Hubway agreement between Boston, Somerville, Brookline, and Cambridge, facilitated by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. I think Hubway stations along the bike path linked to Alewife, and the Minuteman bike path West of Arlington Center would be a great community benefit. I could also (or alternatively) see stations on Mass. Ave near Winter Street, Foster Street, Swan Pl, and Churchill Ave, which would facilitate access to Arlington Center and the surrounding businesses. Thank you.

On Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 3:30 PM, Town of Arlington, MA <[do-not-reply@town.arlington.ma.us](mailto:do-not-reply@town.arlington.ma.us)> wrote:

Master Plan Comments accepted through Jan 20

Date: 01/13/2015 2:28 PM

Master Plan Comments accepted through Jan 20

Written comments on the revised draft master plan will be accepted until close of business January 20th. Please email your comments to [dfields@town.arlington.ma.us](mailto:dfields@town.arlington.ma.us). Updated Draft Master Plan maps can be viewed at [arlingtonma.gov/planning](http://arlingtonma.gov/planning).

To change your eNotification preference, [Click Here](#). To unsubscribe from all Town of Arlington eNotifications, [Click Here](#).